

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

**IN RE: MICHAEL R. SHEMONSKY, : CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:11-CV-01085**  
:  
**Appellant : (Judge Conner)**

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 14th day of November, 2011, upon consideration of the motion (Doc. 8) filed by appellant Michael R. Shemonsky (“Shemonsky”), wherein Shemonsky seeks reconsideration of the order of court (Doc. 7) dated November 3, 2011, and it appearing that the purpose of a motion for reconsideration is to present newly discovered evidence or to correct manifest errors of law or fact, see Harsco Corp. v. Zlotnicki, 779 F.2d 906, 909 (3d Cir. 1985), that the court possesses inherent power to reconsider its orders “when it is consonant with justice to do so,” United States v. Jerry, 487 F.2d 600, 605 (3d Cir. 1973); Alea N. Am. Ins. Co. v. Salem Masonry Co. 301 F. App’x 119, 121 (3d Cir. 2008), and that a party may not invoke a motion for reconsideration as a means to relitigate matters of disagreement with the court, see Abu-Jamal v. Horn, No. Civ. A. 99-5089, 2001 WL 1609761, at \*9 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 18, 2001), and the court concluding that Shemonsky has neither presented newly discovered evidence nor demonstrated that the November 3, 2011, order (Doc. 7) contains a manifest error of law or fact, it is hereby ORDERED that the motion for reconsideration (Doc. 8) is DENIED.

S/ Christopher C. Conner  
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER  
United States District Judge